

Geometric model of the structure of the neutron

Jacek Syska

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract The paper examines the geometrical properties of a six-dimensional Kaluza-Klein type model. They may have an impact on the model of the structure of a neutron and its excited states in the realm of one particle physics. The statistical reason for the six-dimensionality and the stability of the solution is given. The derivation of the weak limit approximation of the general wave mechanical (quantum mechanical) approach, defined in the context of losing its self-consistency (here gravitational), is presented. The non self-consistent case for the Klein-Gordon equation is defined. The derivation of the energy of states and the analysis of the spin origin of the analyzed fields configuration is presented as the manifestation of both the geometry of the internal two-dimensional space and kinematics of fields inside it. The problem of the departure from the (gravitational) self-consistent calculations of the metric tensor and of other fields of the configuration is discussed. The implementation of the model for the description of a neutron and its excited states, including their spins and energies, is given. The informational reason for the existence of the internal extra space dimensions is proposed.

Keywords wave mechanics of neutron · self-consistent Kaluza-Klein field theory

PACS 14.20.Dh · 04.90.+e

1 Introduction

The paper presents the model of an elementary particle and particularly the model of the neutral nucleon and its excited states. Since the model is atomic-like I will give a concise reminder both of the history of the models of an atom and of a neutron which still overlap until the present day.

J. Syska
 Department of Field Theory and Particle Physics, Institute of Physics,
 University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland, and
 Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos and CAFPE, Universidad de Granada, E-18071
 Granada, Spain
 E-mail: jacek.syska@us.edu.pl

Possibly the first model of an atom in the 20-th century was Kelvin's static one [1] of a sphere of uniformly distributed positive electricity with embedded discrete electrons, followed closely by the Thomson's model of "the pudding with raisin muffins in it" [2]. Models also appeared at the end of the 19-th century, stimulated by empirical facts suggesting the complexity of the structure of the atom and its composition from smaller components [3]. As a result, both the theoretical intuition and the empirical indications prompted the sense of the electron to Thomson. He disagreed with the idea of the planetary "point planets" model of the atom but probably was influenced by Maxwell's considerations on Saturn's rings [4]. Hence, contrary to Kelvin's model, the one by Thomson [2] is not static and one of its characteristics is the motion of a ring of n negatively charged particles (electrons [5], as they were called by Stoney [6]), which are set within an uniformly charged sphere (with the radius of the order of 10^{-10} m) having a number of particles which vary from ring to ring. The attractive force of the positively charged sphere and the repulsion of the negatively charged electrons arranged in a series of parallel rings were to guarantee the stability of the system. The strange characteristic of the model is that if the number of the negative particles is larger than 5, some of them must be set in the central position of the sphere yet not necessarily strictly in the center, or else the movement in the atom becomes unstable. This problem still arouses interest until the present day [7].

Thomson's atom has two types of vibrations: the first one connected with the movement of electrons along their orbits and the second one developing out of the distortion of a ring from its equilibrium circular shape in a particular spherical shell. Although the model does not explain the characteristic regularities of the observed spectral lines and the deflection of an electron when it passes through matter, it was regarded as a sufficient one by many physicists until the end of the first decade of the 20th century. This was due to the fact that he found a close relation between the occupation of the electrons inside rings formed in the concentric shells and the regularities inside the Mendeleev's periodic table. However, at the same time some scientists considered that the planetary model of the atom was more appropriate.

In 1920 Rutherford considered his model of the neutron in relation to the compressed hydrogen atom in the core of a star and presented his hypothesis on the structure of the neutron [8]. He perceived the neutron as an electron pressed into the interior of a proton hence his model of the neutron was more in line with Thomson's idea of the atom than of the planetary kind. In 1932 Chadwick experimentally confirmed Rutherford's hypothesis on the existence of the neutron.

In the period from 1925 to 1928 there emerged three formulations of quantum mechanics: Heisenberg's [9], Dirac's [10] and Schrödinger's [11]. They were developed nearly at the same time. The Schrödinger equation provides a direct representation of the mechanical system using the notion of the wave function for a particular state. Here the eigenstate functions form the orthogonal reference frame in the Hilbert space in which the wave function and its time evolution can be analyzed. The specific Schrödinger's substantial approach to the square modulus of the wave function gave the name 'wave mechanics' to his interpretation of quantum mechanics which is in line with de Broglie's theory of phase waves [12,13].

Two questions about the main characteristics of the type of the models of an atom or nucleon built in these formalisms arise. Firstly, are they Thomson's with deep overlapping of constituent fields or planetary-like, for which the constituent fields do not overlap so deeply? On the surface, all of them carry some planetary features, especially if the Hamiltonians of the particular models are analyzed. This may be easily under-

stood because in this respect they are classical mechanics descendants, yet in their main idea connected with the nonlocality of the wave function they are Thomson oriented, regardless of the fact whether the interpretation of the wave function is Schrödinger's or Copenhagen's. Indeed, in the atom the electron wave function is deeply embedded in the nucleus field. Secondly, what is the geometry of the manifold (space or space-time) which forms the background arena for the disputed configurations of fields? The common feature of Thomson's and Schrödinger's like models of the atom is the homogeneity of their space-time structure. We will come back to this problem in the passage below.

Now, let us return to the neutron. Since it seemed that quantum mechanics did not permit a consistent representation of the neutron as a bound state of the proton and electron, the before mentioned Rutherford's conception of the structure of the neutron has been rejected by the majority of physicists. Yet, until now attempts have been made to restore this model. For instance such attempts are connected with the construction of a covering of quantum mechanics known as hadronic mechanics [14] for the specific objective of achieving a consistent quantitative treatment of nonlocal, nonlinear and nonpotential effects in deep wave-overlappings of particles at short distances. As far as the quantum models of the neutron are considered, the most popular is the quantum field theory version of the bag model. Setting aside the difficulties of this model with the determination of the spin of the nucleon we give some literature references [15] only citing after [16]: "... all spin parts [of the nucleon] have to add to $\frac{1}{2}$ which is incredible in the light of the present day experiments. This may indicate that some underlying symmetries, unknown at present, are playing a role in forming the various contributing parts such that the final sum rule gives the fermion $\frac{1}{2}$ value".

Another story is partly connected with the name of Riemann. In his lecture entitled "On the hypotheses that lie at the foundations of geometry" [17], given in 1854, he emphasized that the truth about space has to be discovered¹ from physical experience. The clue is that he noted that the geometry of space could be highly irregular at very small distances, yet appearing smooth at the observed ones. He wrote: "Space [in the large] if one ascribes to it a constant curvature, is necessarily finite, provided only that this curvature has a positive value, however small... . It is quite conceivable that the geometry of space in the very small does not satisfy the axioms of [Euclidean] geometry...".

But the story of the atom and nucleon may be told and retold (at least up to now) in many ways [18]. Not that all of them are right. The latest attractive model of the (hydrogen) atom, based on the isomorphism between Maxwell and Dirac formalisms (or rather on optics-mechanics isomorphism called Hamilton's analogy), is connected with the name of Sallhofer [19]. He worked out the formal mathematical strong similarity (I would not call it identity), in the Minkowski space, between electrodynamics and wave mechanics by means of which he proved that the hydrogen atom might be seen as a pair of mutually refracting electromagnetic waves. Previously this similarity was pointed out with amusement by Sakurai [20].

Below the model of a neutral nucleon will be presented which is more planetary (fields do not overlap very deeply) and incorporates the Riemann's idea of space. The metric of the underlying space-time was previously obtained in [21,22] where a six -

¹ I do not agree with this point of view, but definitely the truth about space is consistent with physical experience. I consider the physical world to be perhaps at least six-dimensional with at least four of these dimensions to be of the space-time origin.

dimensional Kaluza – Klein type model at the classical level is considered. In them the static spherically symmetric solution to the coupled six-dimensional Einstein and Klein-Gordon equations was derived in the presence of the basic massless dilaton field φ which forms a kind of ground field for the self-field of gravitation, the notions of which were discussed elsewhere [23, 24, 25]. The solutions presented in [21] are parameterized by parameter A which has similar dynamical consequences as mass $M = Ac^2/(2G)$ [26], i.e. its existence would be perceived by an observer in the same way as invisible mass which could be the extended "center" of a particle. Because the solution is horizon free hence it is fundamentally different from the four - dimensional Schwarzschild one.

1.1 The motivations for extra dimensions

The idea of the six-dimensional space-time re-enters the physics occasionally [27]-[29]. Yet the motivations for choosing the six-dimensional models were diverse. For instance in [27, 28] Nishino, Salam and Sezgin suggested that one may obtain the fermion spectrum in four-dimensions within the framework of $D=6$, $N = 2$ Kaluza-Klein supergravity. A six-dimensional model of the Kaluza-Klein theory was also previously investigated by Mařika and Syska [29, 24], and by Ivashchuk, Melnikov and Bronnikov [30, 31, 32]. Recently Sparling [33] has followed the concept of $(3 + 3)$ dimensional structure of the space-time [34]. Unfortunately, models described in [33, 34] contain the time component with two additional time dimensions.

However there is a way to extend the four-dimensional space-time to the multi-dimensional one via the Fisherian statistical analysis. Few years ago Frieden proved [35] that the Fisher information channel capacity is the statistical ancestor of the kinematical part of the well known field theory models. Using the channel capacity notion, which is inherently connected with the internal parametric space of the sample (collected by the particle alone), and two informational principles, the structural and the variational one, Frieden obtained the Klein-Gordon equation of motion with the proper relativistic dispersion relation² [35]. The structural information principle has been recently proven in [36]. The point is that the channel capacity which has turned out to be the kinematical part of the action of any field theory model is additive both in the Minkowskian $\nu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and the sample $n = 1, 2, \dots, \aleph$ (parametric) indices [35]. This enables the partition of the channel capacity I into two parts, one for the four-dimensional space-time and the other for the inner parametric space of the sample whose dimension depends on the spinorial representation of the field [35, 36]. When we note by $x_n^\nu = y_n^\nu - \theta_n^\nu$ the added fluctuations of the data y_n^ν (collected by the system alone) from the expectation positions $\theta_n^\nu \equiv \theta^\nu x_n$ [35], then it can be proven that it takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 I &= 4 \sum_{n=1}^{\aleph} \int d^4 y_n \left(\frac{\partial q_n(y_n^\nu)}{\partial \theta_n^\nu} \frac{\partial q_n(y_n^\nu)}{\partial \theta_{\nu n}} \right) \\
 &= \int d^4 x \mathcal{L}_4(g_{\mu\nu}, \varphi_4(x^\nu)) + \int d^{\aleph} x \mathcal{L}_{\aleph}(g_{mn}, \varphi_{\aleph}(x_n)) ,
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

² He obtained the proper structural equation of motions for the Maxwell electromagnetic field, for the Dirac field and for the gravitational field also [35].

where $q_n(y_n^\nu)$ are the original field amplitudes in the sample³ [35,36,37] and x_n^ν are the original Fisherian variables. The amplitudes are factorized as follows $q_n(y_n^\nu) = \varphi_4(x^\nu) \varphi_{\aleph}(x_n)$ and the metric tensor g_{MN} ($M, N \equiv (\mu, \nu = 0, \dots, 3; m, n = 1, \dots, \aleph)$) is obtained effectively from this procedure [38]. Factor 4 in the kinematical form of I signifies the Fisher information origin of the action, yet it does not enter into the equation of motion [35] as it is also factored out from the structural information [36]. For the complex scalar field the dimension $\aleph$ of the extra parametric space is equal to $\aleph = 2$. In this way the six-dimensionality of the space having the mixed space-time and parametric character, is chosen. Hence the model with the internal space geometry of the two-dimensional torus parameterized by two angles will be presented. This provides us with geometry of the internal space, which in Sections 3 and 4 enables the description of the spinorial field. In [21] Biesiada, Mańka and Syska showed that the six-dimensionality of this space-time enables the self-consistency of the background solution of the coupled Einstein and Klein-Gordon equations with internal space, compactified in a non-homogeneous manner. For the sake of clarity, the summary of [21] is presented below in Section 2. In Sections 3 and 4 the model will raise a new issue on the wave-mechanical analysis of the possible general structure of a particle. In Section 4 its application to the description of the neutron and its excited states is presented. In general, statistical models which one can obtain in this way are of the Kaluza-Klein type with four-dimensional space-time and $\aleph$ -dimensional internal (parametric) space.

2 The geometry of the space-time

In [21,22] a $(1 + 5)$ six-dimensional field theory has been considered (see also [39]) which comprises the gravitational self field described by a metric tensor, g_{MN} , and a real massless "basic" scalar (dilatonic) field, φ . We have decomposed the action into two parts:

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{EH} + \mathcal{S}_\varphi = \int d^6 x \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{2\kappa_6} \mathcal{R} + \int d^6 x \sqrt{-g} \frac{-g_{MN}}{2} \partial^M \varphi \partial^N \varphi, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{EH}$ is the Einstein — Hilbert action and $\mathcal{S}_\varphi$ is the action for a real massless scalar (dilatonic) field with the Lagrangian density equal to $\mathcal{L}_\varphi = -\frac{1}{2} g_{MN} \partial^M \varphi \partial^N \varphi$. In Eq.(2) $g = \det g_{MN}$ denotes the determinant of the metric tensor, $\mathcal{R}$ is the curvature scalar of the six - dimensional (in general curved) space-time, and κ_6 denotes the coupling constant of the six-dimensional theory, analogous to the familiar Newtonian gravity constant.

By extremalizing the action given by Eq.(2) we obtain the Einstein equations

$$G_{MN} = \kappa_6 T_{MN}, \quad (3)$$

where $G_{MN} = R_{MN} - \frac{1}{2} g_{MN} \mathcal{R}$ is the Einstein tensor, R_{MN} is the six - dimensional Ricci tensor, $\mathcal{R}$ is the curvature scalar and T_{MN} is the energy - momentum tensor of a real scalar (dilatonic) field φ which is given by

$$T_N^M = \partial_N \varphi \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\varphi}{\partial (\partial_M \varphi)} - \delta_N^M \mathcal{L}_\varphi. \quad (4)$$

³ After squaring each one of $q_n(y_n^\nu)$ and multiplication, the likelihood of the sample is calculated.

Variation of the total action $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to the field φ gives the Klein - Gordon equation

$$\square\varphi \equiv -\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} \partial_M(\sqrt{-g} g^{MN} \partial_N)\varphi = 0 \quad , \quad (5)$$

where g^{MN} is the tensor dual to g_{MN} .

Now consider the six - dimensional space-time which is a topological product of the curved four - dimensional physical space-time (with the metric $g_{\alpha\omega}$, $\alpha, \omega = 0, 1, 2, 3$) and the internal compactified space (with the metric g_{he} , $h, e = 5, 6$). Therefore the metric tensor can be factorized as

$$g_{MN} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{\alpha\omega} & 0 \\ 0 & g_{he} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (6)$$

The four-dimensional diagonal part is assumed to be that of a spherically symmetric geometry

$$g_{\alpha\omega} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{\nu(r)} & & & \\ & -e^{\mu(r)} & 0 & \\ & 0 & -r^2 & \\ & & & -r^2 \sin^2\Theta \end{pmatrix} , \quad (7)$$

where $\nu(r)$ and $\mu(r)$ are (at this stage) two arbitrary functions. Analogously, we take the two-dimensional internal part to be

$$g_{he} = \begin{pmatrix} -\varrho^2(r) \cos^2\vartheta & 0 \\ 0 & -\varrho^2(r) \end{pmatrix} . \quad (8)$$

The six-dimensional coordinates (x^M) are denoted by $(t, r, \Theta, \Phi, \vartheta, \varsigma)$ where $t \in [0, \infty)$ is the usual time coordinate, $r \in [0, \infty)$, $\Theta \in [0, \pi]$ and $\Phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ are the familiar three-dimensional spherical coordinates in the macroscopic space; $\vartheta \in [-\pi, \pi)$ and $\varsigma \in [0, 2\pi)$ are coordinates in the internal two-dimensional parametric space and $\varrho \in (0, \infty)$ is the “radius” of this internal space. We assume that $\varrho(r)$ is the function of the radius r in the external three-dimensional space. The internal space is a 2-dimensional topological torus with r -dependent parameter $\varrho(r)$. Using Eqs.(7)-(8), we can calculate the components of the Ricci tensor. They are given in Appendix A.

Now we seek for a solution of the Einstein equations (see Eq.(3)) with the Ricci tensor given in Appendix A by Eqs.(71)-(74), with $\nu(r) = \mu(r)$, and with the following boundary conditions

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \nu(r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mu(r) = 0 \quad , \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varrho(r) = d = \text{constant} \neq 0 \quad , \quad (9)$$

which at the spatial infinity reproduces the flat external four-dimensional Minkowski space-time and the static internal space of “radius” d which is of the order calculated in Section 4. We also suppose that the scalar field φ is the function of the radius r alone, $\varphi = \varphi(r)$, and we impose the following boundary condition for the scalar field φ :

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(r) = 0 \quad (10)$$

which supplements boundary conditions (9) for the metric components.

By virtue of Eqs.(4) and (2) it is easy to see that the only nonvanishing components of the energy-momentum tensor are

$$-T_r^r = T_t^t = T_\Theta^\Theta = T_\Phi^\Phi = T_\vartheta^\vartheta = T_\zeta^\zeta = \frac{1}{2} g^{rr} (\partial_r \varphi)^2. \quad (11)$$

Consequently, it is easy to verify that the self-consistent solution of the coupled Einstein (3) and Klein-Gordon (5) equations is

$$\nu(r) = \mu(r) = \ln \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right), \quad \varrho(r) = d \sqrt{\frac{r+A}{r}} \quad (12)$$

$$\varphi(r) = \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\kappa_6}} \ln \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right). \quad (13)$$

Hence it results that the only nonzero component of the Ricci tensor (see Eqs.(71)-(74) in Appendix A) is R_r^r . So the curvature scalar $\mathcal{R}$ is equal to

$$\mathcal{R} = R_r^r = \frac{A^2}{2 r^3 (r+A)}, \quad (14)$$

where A is the real constant, with the dimensionality of length, whose value is to be taken from the observation of each particular system (but see Section 4). We notice that all of the six diagonal Einstein equations (3) have shrunk to just one

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{R} = \kappa_6 T_r^r. \quad (15)$$

Now we can rewrite the metric tensor in the form

$$g_{MN} = \text{diag} \left(\frac{r}{r+A}, -\frac{r}{r+A}, -r^2, -r^2 \sin^2 \Theta, -d^2 \frac{r+A}{r} \cos^2 \vartheta, -d^2 \frac{r+A}{r} \right) \quad (16)$$

with its determinant equal to

$$g = \det g_{MN} = -(d^2 r^2 \sin \Theta \cos \vartheta)^2. \quad (17)$$

To summarize we notice that the real massless "basic" free scalar field $\varphi(r)$ (see Eq.(13)) can be the source of the nonzero metric tensor as in Eq.(16). Only when the constant A is equal to zero, the solutions (12) – (13) become trivial and the six-dimensional space-time is Ricci flat.

It is worth noting that since (with the solutions given by Eqs.(12) and (13)) the components R_ϑ^ϑ and R_ζ^ζ of the Ricci tensor (Appendix A) are equal to zero for all values of A , the internal space is always Ricci flat. However, we must not neglect the internal space because its "radius" ϱ is a function of r and the two spaces, external and internal, are therefore "coupled". Only when $A = 0$ are these two spaces "decoupled", and the four-dimensional space-time becomes Minkowski flat⁴.

⁴ When A is not equal to zero, our four-dimensional external space-time is curved. Its scalar curvature $\mathcal{R}_4$ can be given by Eq.(14), i.e. $\mathcal{R}_4 = \mathcal{R} = \frac{A^2}{2 r^3 (r+A)}$.

2.1 Stability of the background solution

The self consistent solution given by Eqs.(13) and (16) of the coupled Einstein and Klein-Gordon equations is unique. To answer the question on the stability of this self-consistent gravity-dilatonic configuration let us calculate its energy:

$$E_{g+\varphi} = \int_V d^5x \sqrt{-g} (G^{tt} + \kappa_6 T^{tt}) \quad (18)$$

where using Eqs.(11)-(17) we obtain:

$$E_{g+\varphi} = -2 \int_V d^5x \sqrt{-g} g^{tt} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{2} = -2Q \quad (19)$$

with

$$Q = 8d^2\pi^2 \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{A^2}{r^2} dr = (2\pi d)(4\pi A^2) \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{d}{\varepsilon}. \quad (20)$$

The integral of $1/r^2$ does not converge on $(0, \infty)$, hence the self consistent solution (13) and (16) cannot be obtained in the limit $E_{g+\varphi} \rightarrow 0$, from the convergent solutions around $E_{g+\varphi} = 0$ corresponding to $A = 0$.

If we depart from the self consistent solution then a similar result can be obtained from the information analysis in the following way. From the notion of the Fisher information [35], we notice that d is (for $r \rightarrow \infty$, see Eq.(12)) the characteristic dimension of the inner parametric space, i.e. the radius of the expected value of the position of the system. In the Frieden analysis r is the added fluctuation to d [35]. Hence if we assume that the fluctuation r is not smaller than the expected value d then the physical limit for the fluctuation r is $\varepsilon \approx d$. In Eq.(20) the cutoff $\varepsilon = d$ can be taken which leads to $Q = Q_{cut} = (2\pi d)(4\pi A^2)$. Therefore Q_{cut} is finite and its value could be even small in contradistinction to the infinite value obtained in Eq.(20) for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in the self consistent case. Hence, we see that the unique self consistent solution given by Eqs.(13) and (16) cannot be destabilized to yield any other.

Let us also notice that in Eq.(18) the partition of $E_{g+\varphi}$ into two parts can be obtained by using the Fisher information formalism developed for physical models by Frieden [35]. According to [35] G^{tt} is connected with the Fisherian kinematical degrees of freedom of the gravitational configuration whereas T^{tt} with its structural degrees of freedom.

To conclude this Section it is worth noting that the metric given by Eq.(16), with the dilatonic field given by Eq.(13), serves, under further conditions discussed below, as a background fields configuration. This metric appears in the equation of motions for all new fields which weakly enter the system.

3 The quantum implication - Klein-Gordon equation. Wave-mechanical approach and weak interaction limit

Until now the calculations were fully self-consistent. The model presented below adds a new scalar field to the system. Yet, since it procures big analytical complications the model will stop being fully self-consistent. This means among others that we will

decline from making the self-consistent correction of the metric (16) received in Section 2. Therefore the following calculations are made totally on the basis of the wave-mechanical approach.

Let us investigate the Klein-Gordon relativistic wave equation for the motion of a scalar particle with a wave function ϕ and mass m (for $m^2 < 0$ it would be a 6-dimensional tachion),

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}} (i\hbar) \partial_M \left(\sqrt{-g} g^{MN} (i\hbar) \partial_N \phi \right) - m^2 c^2 \phi = 0, \quad (21)$$

in the six - dimensional space-time given by the central gravitational field described by the metric, g_{MN} , given by Eq.(16) with its determinant given by Eq.(17). This metric tensor is used in the above Klein-Gordon equation as the background metric only. Hence we neglect the modification of the Einstein equations. Therefore a particle described by the ϕ wave function moves without changing the metric g_{MN} in reciprocal action. This is called the wave-mechanical approach. *But to make our calculations self-consistent by the inclusion of the Einstein equations coupled to Klein-Gordon equation, we should follow the pattern of the previous section for all scalar fields (particles) which have the mass m and are inherently tied up by strong interaction (compare Section 4.3.1). This procedure should give the self-consistent change of the metric tensor g_{MN} .*

We incorporate the so-called "natural interpretation" of the wave equation⁵ [24, 25] with a particle as an oscillating substance described by the wave function ϕ which is deformable according to Eq.(21).

Using Eqs.(16) and (17), we can rewrite the Klein-Gordon equation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sin\Theta \cos\vartheta \left(\frac{r+A}{r} r^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} \right) - \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^2 \frac{r+A}{r} \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial r} \right) \right) \\ & - r^2 \cos\vartheta \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\Theta} \left(\sin\Theta \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\Theta} \right) + \sin\Theta \frac{1}{r^2 \sin^2\Theta} \left(\frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial\Phi^2} \right) \right) \\ & - \frac{r^2}{d^2} \sin\Theta \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} \left(\cos\vartheta \frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\vartheta} \right) + \cos\vartheta \frac{r}{r+A} \frac{\partial^2\phi}{\partial\varsigma^2} \right) \\ & + r^2 \sin\Theta \cos\vartheta \frac{m^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} \phi = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

In order to isolate the time dependence, the standard procedure of the separation of variables is performed with the following factorization of ϕ

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}, \vartheta, \varsigma, t) = u(\mathbf{r}, \vartheta, \varsigma) e^{-i \frac{Et}{\hbar}}. \quad (23)$$

In this way, we obtain the set of stationary states. As the result of further separation in the three-dimensional spherical coordinates $\mathbf{r} = (r, \Theta, \Phi)$ of the macroscopic space and in (ϑ, ς) coordinates of the internal two-dimensional space described by the factorization

$$u(\mathbf{r}, \vartheta, \varsigma) = u_r(r) Y_{LM}(\Theta, \Phi) y_{lm}(\vartheta, \varsigma), \quad (24)$$

⁵ Then we do not have any problems with possible negative values of probability density which is the inherent property of the probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics for the Klein-Gordon equation [40].

we obtain the "almost" familiar radial Klein-Gordon wave equation [40]

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) \left\{ -\frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(\left(\frac{r+A}{r} \right) r^2 \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} \right) + \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2} u_r \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2 c^2} \left\{ E^2 - m^2 c^4 \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) - \lambda_d \frac{\hbar^2 c^2}{d^2} \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right)^2 \right\} u_r \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with the angular equation in the macroscopic space which defines states with a definite three-dimensional angular momentum

$$\begin{aligned} & -\hbar^2 \left[\frac{1}{\sin\Theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial\Theta} \left(\sin\Theta \frac{\partial}{\partial\Theta} \right) + \frac{1}{\sin^2\Theta} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\Phi^2} \right] Y_{LM} \\ &= L(L+1)\hbar^2 Y_{LM} , \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and the angular equation in the inner space with a definite internal angular momentum

$$\frac{1}{\cos\vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} \left(\cos\vartheta \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} y_{l\tilde{m}} \right) + \frac{1}{\partial\varsigma} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varsigma} y_{l\tilde{m}} \right) = -\lambda_d y_{l\tilde{m}} , \quad (27)$$

where λ_d is the main internal angular quantum number. In Eq.(26) functions Y_{LM} are the spherical harmonics (normalized angular momentum eigenfunctions) with $L = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $M = 0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm L$. Similarly $y_{l\tilde{m}}$ are the periodic functions of the inner angles ϑ and ς . As the result of further separation of Eq.(27) in the internal coordinates described by the factorization

$$y_{l\tilde{m}}(\vartheta, \varsigma) = g_l(\vartheta) h_{\tilde{m}}(\varsigma) , \quad (28)$$

we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\cos\vartheta} \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} \left(\cos\vartheta \frac{\partial}{\partial\vartheta} g_l \right) + k_l g_l = 0 , \quad (29)$$

where k_l is the internal ϑ -angle quantum number of the torus geometry (see Section 3.2).

3.1 The case with $\lambda_d = 0$ and $m = 0$ and its difference from others

It is not difficult to verify that for $\lambda_d = 0$ and $m = 0$ the only solution of the stationary Klein-Gordon equation Eq.(25) alone, vanishing in infinity (although not normalizable), exists for $E = 0$ and $L = 0$. For the radial part of ϕ this solution has the following form (see Eq.(13) for $\varphi(r)$):

$$u_r(r) = C \ln \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) , \quad (30)$$

where C is a constant. In this way we formally obtain [21] up to C the same solution which follows from the classical Klein-Gordon equation for the dilaton field (see Eq.(5)). Yet now the field is a scalar one, hence the energy of the configuration (30) is positive and equals:

$$\int_V d^5x \sqrt{-g} T_\phi^{tt} = 2 C^2 Q , \quad (31)$$

where T_ϕ^{tt} is the tt component of the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field ϕ . Integral Q does not converge and is given by Eq.(20)⁶. Yet, fortunately here, we may recall the self-consistent calculations for fields which were previously introduced, i.e. the dilaton φ and metric g_{MN} ones, with the now added scalar field ϕ , which we for the time being assume to be given by the configuration (30). The coupled Einstein and Klein-Gordon field equations for all these fields have to be solved. Now, the case with $\lambda_d = 0$, $m = 0$, $E = 0$ is the only one for which the value of $\hbar$ in Eq.(25) is irrelevant as then the RHS of Eq.(25) becomes equal to zero. Therefore in this case the energy-momentum tensor for the massless scalar field enters into the RHS of Einstein equations (3) in the same way as the dilaton field, differing only in sign. Hence the RHS of Einstein equations (3) becomes equal to zero leading to Ricci flat solution of Einstein equations. Therefore the discussed new configuration of all fields, g_{MN} , φ and ϕ , does not describe the gravitational bound state, contrary to the case of the metric-dilaton field configuration given by Eqs.(13) and (16) alone. Hence the configuration given by Eq.(30) for $m = 0$ and $\lambda_d = 0$ does not appear⁷.

Yet, a similar conclusion would not be true for $\lambda_d > 0$ even for $m = 0$. Indeed, in all these cases the Planck constant $\hbar$ in Eq.(25) becomes important and leads to the appearance of the energy-momentum tensor for the scalar field which is of the order of $\hbar^2$, i.e. $T_{\phi N}^M(\hbar^2)$, hence constituting a very tiny quantity in comparison to the energy-momentum tensor for the dilaton field, $T_N^M(\hbar^0)$ (see Eqs.(11) and (13)), which appears on the RHS of Einstein equations (3). This means that in the first approximation we may treat solutions of Eq.(25) for $\lambda_d > 0$ as leading to small perturbations of the background metric (16), ignoring its self-consistent modification. In other words, the backreaction of ϕ is negligible in this case.

3.2 Further steps for $k_l = l(l+1)$

If the internal ϑ -angle quantum number of the torus geometry is set to $k_l = l(l+1)$ then $g_l(\vartheta) = P_l(\sin\vartheta)$, $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, are the Lagrange polynomials which solve Eq.(29) and hence the second factor on the RHS of Eq.(28) satisfies the following equation (see Eq.(27))

$$\frac{1}{\partial\varsigma} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial\varsigma} h_{\tilde{m}} \right) = -[-l(l+1) + \lambda_d] h_{\tilde{m}}. \quad (32)$$

The condition of continuity of functions $h_{\tilde{m}}(\varsigma)$ for $\varsigma \in [0, 2\pi)$ together with $h_{\tilde{m}}(0) = h_{\tilde{m}}(2\pi)$ give

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\tilde{m}}(\varsigma) &= e^{\pm i\sqrt{-l(l+1)+\lambda_d}\varsigma} \\ &= e^{i\tilde{m}\varsigma}, \quad \tilde{m} = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

⁶ As before in Eq.(20), the integral of $1/r^2$ in Q does not converge on $(0, \infty)$. Hence the solution (30) obtained for $E = 0$, $m = 0$, $\lambda_d = 0$ and $L = 0$ cannot be obtained from the solutions around $E = 0$, $m = 0$ (i.e. in the limit $E \rightarrow 0$, $m \rightarrow 0$) for which the LHS of Eq.(31) converges.

⁷ We may say that solution (30) of Eq.(25) is in this case as "macroscopic" as the dilatonic configuration (13) leading to the zeroing on the RHS of the Einstein equations (3). In other words: The only Thomson like solution of the scalar configuration (30), which by definition cannot be treated as a small perturbation of the metric-dilaton configuration, does not appear at all.

where $\tilde{m}$ is the internal magnetic quantum number. Now, from the above equation we can notice that λ_d is a quantum number which chooses the ladder of values:

$$\lambda_d = l(l+1) + \tilde{m}^2 = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 6, 7, 9, 10, \dots \quad (34)$$

hence $\lambda_d \geq 0$. For example $\lambda_d = 1$ in two cases: ($l = 0$ and $\tilde{m} = 1$) and ($l = 0$ and $\tilde{m} = -1$). Let us also notice that under the assumption of $m = 0$ the case with $\lambda_d = 0$ was previously excluded (Section 3.1)⁸.

3.3 The weak interaction limit

Let us focus on the case of the weak limit which means that we are far away ($r \gg A$) from the central core of the dylatonic field given by Eq.(13). At first let us rewrite Eq.(25) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{A}{r^2} \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^2 \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} \right) + \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2} u_r \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2 c^2} \left\{ E^2 - m^2 c^4 \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right) - \lambda_d \frac{\hbar^2 c^2}{d^2} \left(\frac{r}{r+A} \right)^2 \right\} u_r. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Now, asymptotically (i.e. $r \rightarrow \infty$) the first and third term of the LHS of the above equation could be omitted as they are of smaller order than the others. Yet, the third term, with the orbital angular momentum L , will be preserved as it is important in the angular momentum analysis. From the point of view of the energies⁹ of the excited states (Section 4) it would be better in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$ to omit consistently all terms which are proportional to $\frac{1}{r^2}$ since leaving only the one with L leads, in light of the omission of the first one, to the appearance of nonphysical states.

Nevertheless let us omit the first term in Eq.(35) only which then, after introducing the variable $x = A/r$, could be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & - \frac{1}{A^2} x^4 \frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial x^2} + \frac{x^2}{1+x} \frac{L(L+1)}{A^2} u_r \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar^2 c^2} \left(E^2 - m^2 c^4 \frac{1}{1+x} - \lambda_d \frac{\hbar^2 c^2}{d^2} \left(\frac{1}{1+x} \right)^2 \right) u_r. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Now, let us expand the coefficients in Eq.(36) at point $x = x_0 = 0$ (i.e. $r \rightarrow \infty$) to the second order in x . We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & - \hbar^2 c^2 \left[\frac{x^4}{A^2} \frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial x^2} - (p_0 + p_1 x + p_2 x^2) \frac{L(L+1)}{A^2} u_r \right] \\ &= \left\{ E^2 - (\mu_0 + \mu_1 x + \mu_2 x^2) m^2 c^4 - (\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 x + \lambda_2 x^2) \lambda_d \left(\frac{\hbar c}{d} \right)^2 \right\} u_r, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the coefficients of the expansions and their limits for $x_0 = 0$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$) are given in Appendix B.

⁸ We will see in Section 4.3 that only the mass $m = 0$ satisfies the two physical requirements, the first one of stability and the second one of the proper value of the total spin of the nucleon. Hence eventually only $\lambda_d > 0$ will be possible.

⁹ The situation is similar to the problem of a better description of hydrogen states by the Schrödinger equation than by the Klein-Gordon one.

Finally, after coming back to variable r we obtain for $r \gg A$ the radial part of the Kline-Gordon-like equation, written in the spherical coordinates as follows

$$-\frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r^2 \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} \right) + (U_{Rep} - U_{Attr}) u_r = \frac{(E^2 - m_4^2 c^4)}{\hbar^2 c^2} u_r, \quad (38)$$

where

$$U_{Rep} = \frac{L(L+1) + (\frac{mcA}{\hbar})^2 + 3\lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2}{r^2} \equiv \frac{\mathcal{J}^{(2)}}{r^2}, \quad (39)$$

$$U_{Attr} = \frac{1}{A} \frac{((\frac{mcA}{\hbar})^2 + \lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2)}{r} \equiv \frac{(m_4^2 c^4)}{(\hbar c)^2} \frac{A}{r}, \quad (40)$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}^2 = L(L+1) + (\frac{mcA}{\hbar})^2 + 3\lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2, \quad (41)$$

$$m_4^2 c^4 = m^2 c^4 + \lambda_d(\frac{\hbar c}{d})^2. \quad (42)$$

Here $\mathcal{J}^2$ can be interpreted as the square of the total angular momentum and m_4^2 as the four - dimensional squared mass of the scalar field ϕ in the flat Minkowskian limit (see [41,26]). If the six-dimensional mass is zero ($m = 0$) then the four - dimensional mass at spatial infinity would be solely of kinematical origin. It is also easy to notice that neglecting the first term of Eq.(35) in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$ is at this stage indistinguishable from zeroing the first derivative of the metric tensor¹⁰ in $(\frac{-r}{r+A}) \frac{\partial g^{rr}}{\partial r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r}$ which has its origin in the first term at the LHS of Eq.(25).

Now, it is interesting to notice (see Eq.(38)) that the radial motion looks like the one dimensional motion of a particle with a unit mass in the potential V_{eff}

$$V_{eff}(r) = \frac{\hbar^2}{2} [U_{Rep} - U_{Attr}]. \quad (43)$$

The first component on the right hand side can be interpreted as a modified centrifugal potential energy, and the second one as a potential energy related to some central attractive force. The existence of the second term is connected with the appearance of the effective coupling constant which is proportional to

$$\epsilon = \frac{-(\frac{mcA}{\hbar})^2 - \lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2}{A} = -\frac{m_4^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} A. \quad (44)$$

The value of ϵ depends both on the parameters and the quantum numbers of the model. After introducing $\beta = \alpha r$ we see [40] that Eq.(38) can be rewritten in the following form:

$$\frac{1}{\beta^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \left(\beta^2 \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial \beta} \right) + \left[\frac{\ell}{\beta} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{\mathcal{J}^{(2)}}{\beta^2} \right] u_r = 0, \quad (45)$$

¹⁰ Performing physics in $r \rightarrow \infty$ also means that we neglect in Eq.(35) a "radial force" proportional to $\partial u_r / \partial r$.

where

$$\alpha^2 = \frac{4(m_4^2 c^4 - E^2)}{\hbar^2 c^2}, \quad (46)$$

$$\iota = \frac{-\epsilon}{\alpha}, \quad (47)$$

with $\mathcal{J}^2$ given by Eq.(41).

Eq.(45) has nearly the same formal shape as the radial equation obtained in the Schrödinger's model of the atom [40]. Now, converting Eq.(46) we obtain

$$E^2 = m_4^2 c^4 - \frac{\hbar^2 c^2 \alpha^2}{4}. \quad (48)$$

From the analysis of Eq.(45) it can be shown that the final solutions for $\beta = 0$ and $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ exist only when

$$\iota = n' + j + 1, \quad (49)$$

where n' is zero or a natural number and j is a nonnegative solution of the equation

$$j(j+1) = \mathcal{J}^{(2)} \quad (50)$$

which is equal to

$$j = -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + 4\mathcal{J}^{(2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (51)$$

Finally, using Eq.(47) we can eliminate α from Eq.(48) and rewrite it in the following form:

$$E^2 = m_4^2 c^4 - \frac{1}{4} \hbar^2 c^2 \frac{(-\epsilon)^2}{\iota^2} = m_4^2 c^4 \left[1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{(-\epsilon)}{\iota^2} A \right], \quad (52)$$

where

$$\iota = n' + \frac{1}{2} + \left[\frac{1}{4} + \mathcal{J}^{(2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (53)$$

and in the last equality in Eq.(52) the expression for ϵ given by Eq.(44) has been used.

At the end of this Section let us notice that the original quantum Klein-Gordon equation given by Eq.(22) possesses the property of invariance according to which only the ratio $\frac{r}{A}$ matters. We will discuss the relevant symmetry below. Using this scale invariance, we could move from the microscopic to the astrophysical scale. In this context the calculations point to the similarity of both the neutron and a galaxy dark matter structure (see also [41, 26]).

3.4 Scale invariance

At this point the question concerning the value/s of A arises. Previously [21,22] we considered the model given by Eq.(2) which has the following invariance:

$$A \rightarrow \omega A, \quad r \rightarrow \omega r, \quad d \rightarrow \omega d, \quad ct \rightarrow \omega ct, \quad (54)$$

where ω is the parameter of the transformation. This would mean that it is not the change of A but rather of $\frac{A}{r}$ that matters. This is the invariance of the coupled Einstein (3) and Klein-Gordon (5) equations but it is not the invariance of their solution given by Eqs.(13) and (16). This conclusion can also be drawn from Eq.(14). Hence we notice that the massless dilatonic field φ is the Goldstone field. What is more, using Eqs.(11) and (14) in Eq.(15) we obtain

$$R_r^r = -\kappa_6 (\partial_r \varphi)^2 g^{rr} = \frac{A^2}{2 r^3 (r + A)}. \quad (55)$$

We notice a similarity between this equation and its electromagnetic analog¹¹. Eq.(55) is the (anti)screening current condition in gravitation, analogous to the screening current condition found in electromagnetism or in the electroweak sector in the self-consistent approach [22,25].

On the level of the equations of motion (3) and (5) the theory is scale invariant unless mass m enters. It would seem that invariance (54) leads to the invariance

$$A \rightarrow \omega A, \quad r \rightarrow \omega r, \quad d \rightarrow \omega d, \quad ct \rightarrow \omega ct, \quad m \rightarrow \frac{1}{\omega} m \quad (56)$$

of the Klein-Gordon equation (22). Yet the inclusion of any term with mass m into the model given by Eq.(2) will inevitably lead to the gravitational coupling of the new matter with the metric tensor part of the Lagrangian, causing the breaking of the original invariance (54).

Hence the conclusion emerges that there appears a relation between the four-dimensional mass m_4 and the parameter A . It results from the Einstein equations which fix the value of A after the self-consistent inclusion of the field ϕ with mass m into the fields configuration. This means that the symmetry connected with the scaling (54) of A is broken. Hence in Eq.(41) the dependance of $\mathcal{J}^2$ on A for given m_4 is established, where A is not a free parameter. In view of the lack of a full (self-consistent) analysis, A should be estimated somehow and as we shall see this will appear possible in the weak limit approximation.

3.5 Wave mechanical limit

As we have proven that the global solution with $\lambda_d = 0$ and $m = 0$ does not exist (Section 3.1) hence its weak limit does not exist also. Therefore from now on we will investigate the cases with $\lambda_d > 0$ only. The reason is that, as it has been discussed in Section 3.1, they only slightly perturb the metric-dilaton configuration given by Eqs.(13) and (16). At the moment let us also suppose that $m = 0$, a value which will be dynamically chosen in the next Section.

¹¹ That is $\nabla^2 \mathbf{A} = m_A^2 \mathbf{A}$, where $\mathbf{A}$ is the electromagnetic vector potential.

We began with the Klein-Gordon equation (21) in which ϕ is the wave function, which in quantum mechanics is usually identified as the cause of angular momentum generators commutation relations¹². In our model the square of the total angular momentum $\mathcal{J}^2 = j(j+1)$ appears according to Eq.(41) as the combination of terms $3\lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2$ and $L(L+1)$ which originate from the internal two-dimensional and orbital three-dimensional angular momenta, respectively. Yet, in the weak approximation regime these are j and L which take quantum mechanical values, therefore this means that $3\lambda_d(\frac{A}{d})^2$ chooses quantum mechanical values as a result of the proper addition of j and L only. Furthermore, since j , L and λ_d have quantum values hence $\frac{A}{d}$ also has this kind of values. The strange thing is that term $\frac{A}{d}$ appears as a result of the pure (field theory) classical interaction which originates in the background metric and now has its part in $\mathcal{J}^2$. Next, as $\mathcal{J}$ manifests itself on the arena of the tree-dimensional space as the total angular momentum, we impose on it the usual quantum mechanical rules which lead to different representations for different values of $\mathcal{J}^2$.

This leads us to the indication of the place of wave mechanics (quantum mechanics) which from the point of view of the self-consistent field theory is discussed in [24, 25]. Wave mechanics appears as a theory for building a model of a system (e.g. an atomic one) with the lost of self-consistency, yet it partly works by describing its main characteristics. By "partly" I mean that to receive a correction to the wave mechanics prediction the self-consistency has to be reestablished. Yet this is the realm of quantum field theory or the self-consistent field theory [23, 24, 25, 43]. To receive both the main characteristics and the corrections the gravitational interactions should also be included in a self-consistent manner where the linear part of field fluctuations would be described by the quantum field theory. For the detailed discussion of the place of the quantum field theory see [23].

4 Numerical example: A neutron and its excited states

Although the (internal) spin wave function could not have the (Θ, Φ) space representation for the physical half-spin state, yet it does not eliminate motion as the origin of the spin in some kind of the classical space at all. Besides unknown, mainly three possibilities could be taken into account. The first one states that the parameters of the spin representations are "seen" in the interactions only without further inner explanation. The second one exists by extending the space by the Grassmann coordinates [44]. The third one, considered in this paper, constructs the spin of the particle from the motion in the geometry of the inner space. The half-integer spin is then, as any other, just the numerical result.

The other spin representations of fields could have the similar origin (see Section 1.1). Yet there is a reason to consider them as having the different dimensions of their inner spaces. The prove goes via the Fisherian statistical analysis performed by Frieden [35] and the conclusion is that the dimension of the inner space depends on the species of the field of the rank $\aleph$ which is the dimension of the sample collected by the field alone during its sampling of the space-time. For the complex scalar field the dimension of the extra parametric space is equal to $\aleph = 2$. For the other fields this dimension is bigger, e.g. $\aleph = 4$ for the electromagnetic field and $\aleph = 8$ for the Dirac one. Hence, as

¹² Yet they may be obtained from the commutation relations of rotation operations even before the the quantum mechanics rules enter [42].

it has been mentioned previously, the four-dimensional space-time could be extended simultaneously to the variety of the multi-dimensional ones.

4.1 Neutron

Let us make some numerical adjustments for the parameters of the presented model ($\aleph = 2$). For this purpose we begin with the state which possesses the following value of the internal quantum number (see Sections 3.1-2):

$$\lambda_d = 1 , \quad (57)$$

choosing the following value of the four dimensional mass:

$$m_4 \approx 952.893194 \text{ MeV}/c^2 , \quad (58)$$

which is a little bit bigger than the observed mass of the neutron $939.56536 \text{ MeV}/c^2$. Solving Eq(42) we obtain

$$d = d_l \approx 2.071 \cdot 10^{-16} \text{ m} = 0.2071 \text{ fm} \quad (59)$$

as the limit value, i.e. from Eq(42) we see that for $d > d_l$ we obtain $m^2 > 0$ and for $d < d_l$ we obtain $m^2 < 0$ which is a tachion. For the limit value $m^2 = 0$ the second term of $\mathcal{J}^{(2)}$ at the RHS of Eq.(41) is equal to

$$\left(\frac{mcA}{\hbar}\right)^2 = 0 . \quad (60)$$

Now, it is interesting to notice that the RHS of Eq.(41) might be interpreted as $j(j+1)$ (see Eq.(50)), which means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^{(2)} &= L(L+1) + \left(\frac{mcA}{\hbar}\right)^2 + 3\lambda_d \left(\frac{A}{d}\right)^2 \\ &= j(j+1) . \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

After taking $L = 0$ and $j = 1/2$ for the neutron the equation on the relative value of A and d is obtained from the above equation. Moreover, we see that Eq.(61) gives us

$$\frac{A}{d} = 1/2 \quad \text{for } d = d_l , \quad (m^2 = 0) . \quad (62)$$

Now, according to Eqs.(52) and (44) we obtain for $m = 0$ and $\frac{A}{d}$ as in Eq.(62) the following equation

$$E^2 = m_4^2 c^4 \left[1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{(-\epsilon A)^2}{l^2} \right] = m_4^2 c^4 \left[1 - \frac{1}{36} \left(\frac{3/2}{\iota}\right)^2 \right] \quad (63)$$

and using in this equation m_4 from Eq.(58) we find that the energy of the neutron in the ground state ($n' = 0$, $j = 1/2$ and $\iota = 3/2$, see Eq.(49)) is equal to

$$E = 939.565 \text{ MeV}/c^2 \quad (64)$$

which is the observed mass of the neutron. From the second term of Eq.(63) it results that the gravitational correction to the energy of the nucleon in the ground state ($n' = 0$ and $j = 1/2$ and $\iota = 3/2$), i.e. the gravitational bounding energy, is equal to

$$\Delta E = E - m_4 c^2 \approx -0.0139867 m_4 c^2. \quad (65)$$

Finally, let us recall that the solution for $\lambda_d = 1$ has according to Eqs.(33) and (34) the double degeneration: ($l = 0$ and $\tilde{m} = 1$ - which we interpret as the spin up solution) or ($l = 0$ and $\tilde{m} = -1$ - which we interpret as the spin down solution). This assignment is very natural but by its own it does not lead to the conclusion that the particle is the neutron. The calculation of the energy of the ground state of a field having the "quantum" numbers characteristic for the neutron entitles only to the conclusion that the formalism could describe the neutron. Hence we see that the model points to the origin of the spin of the nucleon as connected with the geometry of the internal manifold and with motion inside its two compactified parametric dimensions. Moreover, it indicates that gravitational effects give a visible change of the spectrum of the levels in the proposed model of the nucleon.

As it has been shown, the background gravity-dilatonic configuration given by Eqs.(13) and (16) is stable (see Section 2.1). Also the ground state solution obtained in Section 3 for the scalar field ϕ is the stationary one. Moreover, it perturbs the background configuration slightly only (see Section 3.1) and in the discussed weak approximation we could argue that the whole configuration of the fields, g_{MN} , φ and ϕ , is stable. Finally, for a particle with another value of its spin the dimension $\aleph$ of the inner parametric space is different, yet the conclusion, if the relevant calculations are performed, would be similar.

4.2 The value of $m = 0$

Let us still consider one particular state (e.g. neutron) with m_4^2 fixed, i.e. m and d may vary leaving m_4^2 unchanged. Now, with the use of Eq.(42) we notice that Eq.(61) can be rewritten as follows

$$\mathcal{J}^{(2)} = j(j+1) = L(L+1) + m_4^2 c^4 \left(\frac{A}{c\hbar}\right)^2 + 2\lambda_d \left(\frac{A}{d}\right)^2 \quad (66)$$

hence we see that $\mathcal{J}^{(2)}$ for $\lambda_d > 0$ is not proportional to $m_4^2 c^4$ (no matter what the integer L is) and it is worth noting that to keep $\mathcal{J}^{(2)}$ equal to $j(j+1)$ for j equal to the multiplicity of $1/2$, it is necessary to have $m = 0$ (hence $m_4^2 c^4 = \lambda_d (\frac{\hbar c}{d})^2$) without any variation from this particular value of m .

4.3 Excited states

As in Section 4.1 the value of m_4 for the neutron has been chosen to fit the value of the observed energy E of the neutron hence it is important to calculate the predictions for values of the energy of its excited states. Let us make the following assumption on the relation between the total angular momentum number and the orbital one:

$$j = L + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (67)$$

For the mass $m = 0$ we may notice from Eq.(61) that the characteristic radius A has to change with j , L and λ_d in the following way

$$A = \frac{d \sqrt{j(1+j) - L(1+L)}}{\sqrt{3} \sqrt{\lambda_d}} \quad \text{for } m = 0, \quad (68)$$

where d is kept equal to $d_l = 0.2071$ [fm] as in Eq.(59). Then, with m_4 given for each particular state by Eq.(42), the energy E is calculated according to Eq.(52). The numerical values of the energy E for the ground state ($j = \frac{1}{2}$, $\lambda_d = 1$) and excited states of the neutron are given in the Table 1 below.

Except for the ground state (which has been chosen to fit the neutron observed energy) all other energies are not ideally equal to the observed ones [45]. Nevertheless this might not be a big shortcoming of the model since we use the weak approximation only. This statement appears to be sensible, especially in the light of the agreement of the order of the discrepancies between energies of the states belonging to the same column and different rows, which are of the order found in the experiment. As the spacial configurations for the first column in the Table 1 are the most simple ones ($L = 0$) hence the feeling is that only they should lie in the neighborhoods of the true states (see also the discussion after Eq.(35)).

Table 1 Values of energies E MeV for the ground state and excited states of the neutron as the function of the total angular momentum number j and internal quantum number λ_d . For the neutron itself $j = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\lambda_d = 1$. The last two columns present the gravitational bounding energy ΔE MeV and the ratio A/d for the neutron and its excited states with $j = 1/2$ and $L = 0$. All states in the Table 1 have $m = 0$ and $d = d_l = 0.2071$ fm (see the text).

λ_d	$j=1/2$	$3/2$	$5/2$	$7/2$	$9/2$	$\Delta E(j=1/2)$	$A/d(j=1/2)$
1	939.565	941.71	943.938	945.512	946.638	-13.3278	0.5
2	1328.75	1331.78	1334.93	1337.16	1338.75	-18.8484	0.3536
3	1627.37	1631.09	1634.95	1637.67	1639.63	-23.0845	0.2887
4	1879.13	1883.42	1887.88	1891.02	1893.28	-26.6557	0.25
6	2301.46	2306.71	2312.17	2316.02	2318.78	-32.6464	0.2041
	$L = 0$	1	2	3	4	$L = 0$	$L = 0$

4.3.1 The gravitational bounding energy

Additionally, in the two last columns of the Table 1, the values of the gravitational bounding energy

$$\Delta E = E - m_4 c^2 = m_4 c^2 \left[\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{(-\epsilon A)}{t^2}} - 1 \right], \quad (69)$$

for the states with $j = \frac{1}{2}$ and $L = 0$ are given. Here, according to Eqs.(44) and (42) the effective coupling constant ϵ and the the four - dimensional squared mass m_4^2 are for $m = 0$ equal to

$$\epsilon = -\frac{m_4^2 c^2}{\hbar^2} A \quad \text{and} \quad m_4^2 c^4 = \lambda_d \left(\frac{\hbar c}{d} \right)^2 \quad \text{for } m = 0, \quad (70)$$

where A is given by Eq.(68).

The important result is that for fixed j and L , the increase of the energy E of the configuration causes the system to become more tightened (as the ratio A/d decreases) and simultaneously its gravitational bounding energy bigger. As an example, for the neutron and its excited states (with $j = 1/2$ and $L = 0$) this result has been presented in the first and in the two last columns of the Table 1 (in bold).

The model could be applied to the other known particles also, yet the present calculations show that the best agreement is achieved for the neutron and its excited states. For example, for the neutral meson ρ_o taken as the ground state and the first five of its excited states, for all of which we choose $j = 1$, $n' = 0$, $\iota = 2$ and $L = 0$, we obtain the energies equal to 1454.5, 2056.97, 2519.26, 2909.0, 3562.78, 3848.24 MeV for λ_d equal to 1,2,3,4,6,7, respectively. So, in this case we notice the worse matching with the experimental values [45] than in the case of the neutron. The explanation of this fact might be that the gravitational factor in the structure of the neutron, which is the lowest known barionic neutral ground state, is most decisive than in the case of other neutral baryons.

4.3.2 The problem with the degeneracy

The principal problem seems to be connected with the ladder of the energy state values in each particular row since in each row few of them or may be only one are physical. This problem might be connected with the zeroing of the term with the first derivative of the metric tensor and hence with the removal of the first derivative of the radial wave function u_r on passing from Eq.(35) to Eq.(36). Unfortunately, after this zeroing, the weak limit approximation was invented, leading effectively to the introduction of an extra force term (which is equal to the neglected one with the opposite sign) connected with the mathematics of the weak approximation only. The addition of this unphysical extra force into the system results in appearance of row ladders of the unphysical states. Yet the unphysical differences between states of the ladder in one particular row with the established value of λ_d are two order of magnitude smaller than the physical ones from the columns. This agrees with the fact that the differences in one row appear as the result of the change in the value of L . Now, according to Section 3.3 the orbital angular momentum L survived with the third term $\left(\frac{r}{r+A}\right) \frac{L(L+1)}{r^2} u_r$ of Eq.(35). Yet it survived inconsistently because the first term $\frac{A}{r^2} \left(\frac{r}{r+A}\right) \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r}$ of this equation, also proportional to $\frac{1}{r^2}$, has been neglected. Since the third term of Eq.(35) is, for $r \rightarrow \infty$, of the order smaller than the ones which remained together with it in Eq.(36) (and consequently in Eq.(38)) therefore the energy differences in a particular row are also smaller than in a particular column. The analysis of Eqs.(38)-(40) is in agreement with the remarks above, i.e. the change of L in $U_{Rep} \sim \frac{1}{r^2}$ is connected with the small energy differences in a particular row whereas the change of λ_d in $U_{Attr} \sim \frac{1}{r}$ is connected with the big energy differences in a particular column of the Table 1. As we noticed in Section 3.3 the term with L has been left for the sake of the angular momentum considerations.

5 Conclusions

Till now there does not exist established experimental evidence for multi-dimensionality of the world and/or our understanding of potential manifestations of higher dimensions

is too poor. Yet at the same time there exist in the literature multiple references indicating that the pursued effects of extra dimensions could have already been noticed earlier, both in the astrophysical [46, 47], [21, 22, 41, 26] and in elementary particle scale [48], [24, 49], contrary to the standard expectations that extremely high energies are necessary to probe higher dimensions. The renewed interest in the Kaluza-Klein theories, to which the presented six-dimensional model belongs, stems from the fact that multidimensional analogues of general relativity are able, among others, to generate the four dimensional mass out of the interaction which proceeds both from the four-dimensional world and from the internal space dimensions (here two) with currents of the matter which modify masses in the four-dimensional world (see also [26]). Our approach to the modelling of a system, e.g. of one particle (here neutron), stems from the hope that its structure might be described by the dynamics in the six-dimensional space-time, and especially that its spin and, at least partly its inertia have their origin in the internal two-dimensional space. This is the reason for perceiving six-dimensional (and more generally, multi-dimensional¹³) theories as still attractive for understanding both fundamental interactions and the more sophisticated considerations which are related to the problem of Mach's principle.

To fulfil this aim the present paper examines the implementation of the geometrical properties of the previously [21] worked out six-dimensional Kaluza-Klein type model which manifest themselves in possible observational consequences in the realm of one particle physics, e.g. having an impact on the structure of neutron and its excited states. The obtained ground state solution, here neutron, appeared to have two spinorial degrees of freedom as the total angular momentum with $j = 1/2$ goes (for the main internal angular quantum number $\lambda_d = 1$) with two internal magnetic quantum number possibilities, $\tilde{m} = 1$ or $\tilde{m} = -1$. In Section 1.1, the statistical Fisherian reasons for the six-dimensionality of the space-time are given. The fundamentals of the model are presented in Section 2 where the static spherically symmetric "reference" back-ground solution of the six-dimensional Einstein equations coupled with the Klein-Gordon equation with the dilatonic field as the basic one and the gravitational field as the self-field, is recalled [21]. A more detailed discussion of its properties is presented in [21, 22, 41, 26]. The metric tensor part of the "reference" solution is, in a sense, analogous to the familiar four-dimensional Schwarzschild solution but yet fundamentally different since it is horizon free. In Section 2.1 the stability of the "reference" self-consistent solution is shown. Section 3 is devoted to the derivation of the weak limit approximation of the general wave mechanical (quantum mechanical) approach which is defined in the context of losing (here gravitational) self-consistency. So, a new scalar field has been added to the original "reference" configuration of fields and the non self-consistent case for its Klein-Gordon equation is defined. Here the main purpose is to find the solution of this Klein-Gordon equation and the reason for doing this is twofold. On one hand it is connected with the derivation of the energy of states. On the other hand with the indication of the spin origin of the configuration as the manifestation of both the geometry of the internal two-dimensional space and the kinematics of the fields inside it. In Section 3.1 the problem of the departure from the (gravitational) self-consistent calculations of the metric and other fields of the configuration has been discussed. The lost of the self-consistency is connected with neglecting the perturbation term (of the total energy-momentum tensor) which is proportional to $\hbar^2$. In Section 4 the imple-

¹³ For example, in the case of the electromagnetism for which $\aleph = 4$, the space-time would be eight-dimensional.

mentation of the model to the description of neutron and its excited states has been performed, including the derivation of their energy. Finally, the discussion of the consequences of zeroing of the first derivative term in the radial Klein-Gordon equation has been given in Section 4.3.

The question arises on the status of the presented model of the neutron. As discussed previously in Sections 3 and 4 it is interpreted as the wave mechanical departure from the fully (i.e. including gravitation) self-consistent field theory understood in accordance with the Schrödinger's substantial interpretation of the wave function [24, 25]. The wave mechanical approach means that the self-consistency is lost. Yet there is hope that a fully self-consistent model which incorporates all the necessary fields and interactions will result not only in the refinement of the proposed model of the neutron and its excited states but also in the construction of better models of all other elementary matter particles. Yet this is the difficult task to perform [23, 24, 25, 43].

In today's physics mainly the wave mechanical (weak approximation case) and quantum field theory (linear) regimes are perceived. Yet self-consistent exceptions are also quoted, developed only for the description of the (mainly linear) fluctuations of the matter wave function [23]. The concept which lies behind this approach is not the quantum theory of interactions with quantum gravity included [50] with the second quantization procedure for a set of aggregated quanta. But, it is rather of a relativistic self-consistent field theory origin which includes all interactions, with gravity in this number. The consistency of this approach is guaranteed on the theoretical basis which is stronger than the mean-field theory concept as both wave mechanics and classical field theories can be understood as having the same, Fisher-information origin with finite N [35, 36].

Finally, according to the calculation of this paper, Mach's principle has to be modified. Since the mass of a particle comes both from external and internal dimensions (where the internal part of this mass is purely of the kinetic origin) hence it is essential that the final mass of the particle should be calculated in the self-consistent formalism. It might be done in accord with a broadened version of Thirring and Einstein analysis of Einstein geometrodynamics or in accord with an effective gravity theory of the Logunov type [38]. In both cases the internal contribution to the mass should appear as the result of the self-consistent calculations. Interestingly the same conclusions were drowned by Frieden [35] from the statistical method of estimating the physical models and just recently proved in [36], where the entanglement between the kinematical and structural degrees of freedom has been rigorously established. Now, because the mass has its origin in the dynamics and the kinetic motion of the (extended) field of every elementary particle inside the internal space, we obtain an elementary property according to which every particle is a continuously extended object.

Yet, the presented model is obviously not the final one. The reason is twofold. At first, from its beginning it was formulated for the neutral particle only. The inclusion of e.g. the electric or effective weak charges, which would be necessary, changes the results¹⁴. At second, the first particle in every chosen ladder of states should really be the ground state of the configuration of all fields which are taken into account to describe self-consistently both the ground state and excited states. Hence, further calculations should incorporate more realistic shapes of both the main charge densities and their fluctuations for the extended basic matter sources to which proper self-fields are cou-

¹⁴ For the self-consistent analysis in the classical counterpart of the electroweak model see [25].

pled. These shapes should follow both from the Einstein equations coupled to e.g. Klein-Gordon-Maxwell (effective Yang-Mills) or Dirac-Maxwell (effective Yang-Mills) set of equations for charge densities and fluctuations simultaneously, as it is required for the self-consistent models [25]. It means that from the mathematical point of view, a matter particle seems to be a self-consistent solution of field equations for the basic fields (including fluctuations) and their self-fields which are involved in the description of this particle. The presented model indicates the place where the weak, wave mechanical limit of the theory lies and is a step towards the construction of the self-consistent formalism of the classical theory of one, continuously extended, elementary particle.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by L.J.Ch..

Special thanks to Barbara Mierzyńska for the correction of the text. This work has been also supported by the Department of Field Theory and Particle Physics, Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, the project "Teoretyczne i fenomenologiczne badanie Modelu Standardowego i jego uogólnień", No: BS-03-0507-022-07 and by the Junta de Andalucía project FQM 437.

Appendix A: The components of the Ricci tensor of the background metric

Using Eqs.(7)-(8), we can calculate the components of the Ricci tensor. The nonvanishing components are [21,22]

$$R_t^t = (4 \varrho^2 r \nu' + 4 r^2 \varrho' \varrho \nu' - r^2 \varrho^2 \mu' \nu' + r^2 \varrho^2 (\nu')^2 + 2 r^2 \varrho^2 \nu'') (4 e^\mu r^2 \varrho^2)^{-1} \quad (71)$$

$$R_r^r = (-4 \varrho^2 r \mu' - 4 r^2 \varrho' \varrho \mu' - r^2 \varrho^2 \mu' \nu' + r^2 \varrho^2 (\nu')^2 + 8 r^2 \varrho \varrho'' + 2 r^2 \varrho^2 \nu'') (4 e^\mu r^2 \varrho^2)^{-1} \quad (72)$$

$$R_\Theta^\Theta = R_\Phi^\Phi = (-4 e^\mu \varrho^2 + 4 \varrho^2 + 8 r \varrho \varrho' - 2 r \varrho^2 \mu' + 2 r \varrho^2 \nu') (4 e^\mu r^2 \varrho^2)^{-1} \quad (73)$$

$$R_\vartheta^\vartheta = R_\varsigma^\varsigma = (8 \varrho r \varrho' + 4 r^2 (\varrho')^2 - 2 r^2 \varrho \varrho' \mu' + 2 r^2 \varrho \varrho' \nu' + 4 r^2 \varrho \varrho'') (4 e^\mu r^2 \varrho^2)^{-1} \quad (74)$$

Appendix B: The weak interaction limit coefficients

The coefficients of expansions of the radial equation (37) and their limits for $x_0 = 0$ ($r \rightarrow \infty$) are equal to

$$p_0 = -\frac{x_0^3}{(1+x_0)^3} = 0, \quad p_1 = \frac{3x_0^2 + x_0^3}{(1+x_0)^3} = 0, \quad p_2 = \frac{1}{(1+x_0)^3} = 1, \quad (75)$$

$$\mu_0 = \frac{1 + 3x_0 + 3x_0^2}{(1+x_0)^3} = 1, \quad \mu_1 = -\frac{1 + 3x_0}{(1+x_0)^3} = -1, \quad \mu_2 = \frac{1}{(1+x_0)^3} = 1, \quad (76)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{1 + 3x_0 + 5x_0^2}{(1+x_0)^4} = 1, \quad \lambda_1 = -\frac{1 + 7x_0}{(1+x_0)^4} = -1, \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{3}{(1+x_0)^4} = 3. \quad (77)$$

References

1. Kelvin, Lord, *Aepinus Revisited*, Philos. Mag. VI **3**, (1902), 257-283; *On the weights of atoms*, Philos. Mag. VI **4**, 177-198, (1902).
2. J.J. Thomson, Philos. Mag. **7**, 237, (1904).
3. Chemical Rubber Co., *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, CRC, 68th edn., pp.F-157, (1987).
4. J.C. Maxwell, *On theories of the constitution of Saturn's rings*, Edinburgh R. Soc. Proc. **IV**, 99-101, (1862).
5. J.J. Thomson, *Cathode rays*, Philos. Mag. **44**, 293-316, (1897).
6. G.J. Stoney, *On the 'electron' or atom of electricity*, Letter in Philos. Mag. **38**, 418-420, (1894).
7. J. De Luca, S.B. Rodrigues, Y. Levin, *Electromagnetic instability of the Thomson Problem*, Europhys. Lett. **71**, 84, (2005), cond-mat/0506616.
8. E. Rutherford, Proc. of the Royal Society, Vol. A **97**, 394, (1920).
9. W. Heisenberg, *Über quantenmechanische Umdeutung kinematischer und mechanischer Beziehungen*, Z. Phys. **33**, 879-893, (1925).
10. P.A.M. Dirac, *The fundamental equations of quantum mechanics*, Proc. R. Soc. London, Series A **109**, 642-653, (1925); *Quantum mechanics and a preliminary investigation of the hydrogen atom*, Proc. R. Soc. London, Series A **110**, 561-579, (1926); *The quantum theory of the electron*, Proc. R. Soc. London, Series A **117**, 610-624, (1928); *The quantum theory of the electron*, Proc. R. Soc. London, Series A **118**, 351-361, (1928).
11. E. Schrödinger, *Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. (Erste Mitteilung)*, Ann. Phys. **79**, 361-376, (1926); *Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. (Zweite Mitteilung)*, Ann. Phys. **79**, 489-527, (1926); *Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. (Dritte Mitteilung: Störungstheorie mit Anwendung auf den Starkeffekt der Balmerlinien)*, Ann. Phys. **80**, 437-490, (1926); *Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. (Vierte Mitteilung)*, Ann. Phys. **81**, 109-139, (1926).
12. L. de Broglie, *Recherches Sur La Theorie Des Quanta*, Ph.D. dissertation, Paris, (1924).
13. J.M. Espinosa, *Physical properties of de Broglie's phase waves*, Am. J. Phys. **50**, 357-362, (1982).
14. A.A. Albert, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **64**, (1948), 552.
R.M. Santilli, Hadronic J. **1**, 224, (1978); Hadronic J. **1**, 574 and 1267, (1978); Communication of the JINR, Dubna, Russia, # E4-93-352, (1993); Chinese J.Syst.Ing. & Electr. **6**, 177, (1996). S. Lie, *Über en Classe Geometrische Transformationen*, English translation by E. Trell, Algebras Groups and Geometries **15**, 395, (1998).
15. U. Stiegler, Phys. Rep. **277**, 1, (1996).
X. Zheng et al., *(the Jefferson Lab Hall A Collaboration)*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 012004, (2004), *Precision Measurement of the Neutron Spin Asymmetry A_1^n and Spin-Flavor Decomposition in the Valence Quark Region*, nucl-ex/0308011.
16. K. Heyde, *Basic ideas and concepts in nuclear physics*, 3rd ed., IOP Publishing Ltd, 577, (2004).
17. G.F.B. Riemann, *Bei die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zur Grunde liegen*, in *Gesammelte Mathematische Werke*, (1866); reprint of 2d ed., ed. H.Weber (Dover, New York), (1953); see also the translation by W.K.Clifford, Nature **8**, 14-17, (1973).
18. A. Lakhtakia (ed.), *Models and modelers of hydrogen*, (World Scientific), (1996).
19. H. Sallhofer, *Hydrogen in Electrodynamics. VI. The General Solution*, Z. Naturforsch. **45a**, 1361-1366, (1990).
20. J.J. Sakurai, *Advanced quantum mechanics*, (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company), 169, (1967).
21. M. Biesiada, R. Mańka and J. Syska, Inter. Journal of Modern Physics **D**, Vol.9, Nu.1, (2000); R. Mańka and J. Syska, *Nonhomogeneous six-dimensional Kaluza-Klein compactification*, preprint UŚL-TP-95/03, University of Silesia, (1995).
22. J. Syska, *Self-consistent classical fields in gauge field theories*, (University of Silesia), PhD thesis (unpublished), (1995/99).
23. B.O. Barut, J. Kraus, *Nonperturbative quantum electrodynamics: The Lamb shift*, Found. Phys. **13**, 189-194, DOI:10.1007/BF01889480, (1983). A.O. Barut, J.F. Van Huele, *Quantum electrodynamics based on self-energy: Lamb shift and spontaneous emission without field quantization*, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 3187-3195, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.32.3187, (1985). A.O. Barut, J.P. Dowling, *Quantum electrodynamics based on self-energy: Spontaneous*

- emission in cavities*, Phys. Rev. A **36**, 649-654, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.36.649, (1987). A.O. Barut, *Combining relativity and quantum mechanics: Schrödinger's interpretation of ψ* , Found. Phys. **18**, 95-105, DOI:10.1007/BF01882875, (1988); *Schrödinger's interpretation of ψ as a continuous charge distribution*, Ann. Phys. (Leipzig), **45**, 31-36, (1988); *The revival of Schrödinger's interpretation of quantum mechanics*, Found. Phys. Lett. **1**, 47-56, DOI:10.1007/BF00661316, (1988). A.O. Barut, *Quantum-electrodynamics based on self-energy*, Phys. Scr. T **21**, 18-21, (1988); A.O. Barut, Y.I. Salamin, *Relativistic theory of spontaneous emission*, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 2284-2296, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.37.2284 (1988). A.O. Barut and N. Ünal, *An exactly soluble relativistic quantum two-fermion problem*, J. Math. Physics **27**, 3055, DOI:10.1063/1.527235, (1986); A.O. Barut and N. Ünal, Physica A **142**, *A new approach to bound-state quantum electrodynamics: I. Theory*, pp.467-487, doi:10.1016/0378-4371(87)90036-7, and *A new approach to bound-state quantum electrodynamics: II. Spectra of positronium, muonium and hydrogen*, pp.488-497, doi:10.1016/0378-4371(87)90037-9, (1987).
24. J. Syska, *Remarks on self-consistent models of a particle*, in *Trends in Boson Research*, ed. A.V. Ling, (Nova Science Publishers), 163-181, (2006).
 25. J. Syska, *Boson ground state fields in the classical counterpart of the electroweak theory with non-zero charge densities*, in *Frontiers in field theory*, ed. O. Kovras, (Nova Science Publishers), (Nowy Jork 2005), chapter 6, 125-154 and in *Focus on Boson Research*, (Nova Publishers), 233-258, (2006).
 26. M. Biesiada, J. Syska, *Motion of test particles in six-dimensional dilatonic Kaluza-Klein theory*, sent for the review to General Relativity and Gravitation, (2009).
 27. M. Nishino and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **B 144**, 187, (1984).
 28. A. Salam and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **B 147**, 47, (1984).
 29. R. Mañka and J. Syska, *Torus compactification of six-dimensional gauge theory*, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **15**, 751-764, doi: 10.1088/0954-3899/15/6/007, (1989).
 30. V.D. Ivashchuk and V.N. Melnikov, Class. Quantum Grav. **11**, 1793, (1994).
 31. V.D. Ivashchuk and V.N. Melnikov, Grav. & Cosmol. **1** No2, 133, (1995). V.D. Ivashchuk, PhD Dissertation, (VNICPV, Moscow, 1989).
 32. K.A. Bronnikov and V.N. Melnikov, Annals of Physics (N.Y.) **239**, 40, (1995).
 33. G.A.J. Sparling, Proc.R.Soc.A doi:10.1098/rspa.2007. 1839, (2007).
 34. P. Demers, Can.J.Phys. **43**, 1687, (1975). E.A.B. Cole, Nuovo Cimento A **40**, 171, (1977). C.E. Patty, Jr., L.L. Smalley, Phys.Rev.D **32**, Nu.4, 891-897, (1985).
 35. B.R. Frieden, Found. Phys.**16**, 883, (1986). B.R. Frieden, *Fisher information, disorder, and the equilibrium distributions of physics*, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 4265, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.41.4265, (1990). B.R. Frieden, B.H. Soffer, *Lagrangians of physics and the game of Fisher-information transfer*, Phys. Rev. E **52**, No.3, 2274-2286, (1995). B.R. Frieden, *Relations between parameters of a decoherent system and Fisher information*, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 022107, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.66.022107, (2002). B.R. Frieden, A. Plastino, A.R. Plastino and B.H. Soffer, *Schrödinger link between nonequilibrium thermodynamics and Fisher information*, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 046128, DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.66.046128, (2002); Phys. Lett. A **304**, 73, (2002). B.R. Frieden, *Science from Fisher information: A unification*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004). B.R. Frieden, B.H. Soffer, *Information-theoretic significance of the Wigner distribution*, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052108, DOI:10.1103/PhysRevA.74.052108, (2006).
 36. J. Syska, *Fisher information and quantum-classical field theory: classical statistics similarity*, Phys. Stat. Sol.(b) 244, No.7, 2531-2537, (2007)/DOI 10.1002/pssb.200674646, arXiv:physics/0811.3600. E.W. Piotrowski, J. Śladkowski, J. Syska, S. Zając, *The method of the likelihood and the Fisher information in the construction of physical models*, accepted for publication in Phys. Stat. Sol.(b), Volume 246, Issue 5 (2009), arXiv:physics/0811.3554.
 37. S. Amari, H. Nagaoka, *Methods of information geometry*, chapter 2.6, (Oxford Univ. Press, 2000).
 38. V.I. Denisov and A.A. Logunov, *The Theory of Space-Time and Gravitation*, in *Gravitation and Elementary Particle Physics*, Physics Series, ed. A.A. Logunov, (MIR Publishers, Moscow), 14-130, (1983).
 39. S.Chen, B. Wang, R. Su, Phys. Lett.B **647**, 282-287, (2007).
 40. L.I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics*, 3rd ed., (1968).
 41. M. Biesiada, K. Rudnicki and J. Syska, *An alternative picture of the structure of galaxies*, in *Gravitation, Electromagnetism and Cosmology: toward a new synthesis*, ed. K. Rudnicki, (Apeiron, Montreal), 31, (2001).

42. J.J. Sakurai, *Modern quantum mechanics*, ed. San Fu Tuan, (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company), (1994).
43. E.T. Jaynes, *Coherence and Quantum Optics*, ed. by L. Mandel and E. Wolf, (Plenum, New York), 495-509, (1978).
P.W. Milonni, *Foundations of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electrodynamics*, ed. by A.O. Barut, (Plenum, New York), 15, (1980).
44. P.D. Mannheim, *Classical spin and its quantization*, Phys.Rev.D **32**, Nu.4, 898, (1985).
45. W.M. Yao *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **33**, (2006).
46. P.S. Wesson, ApJ **394**, 19, (1992).
J. M. Overduin, P. S. Wesson, *Kaluza-Klein Gravity*, Phys. Rept. **283**, 303-380, (1997), gr-qc/9805018.
P.S. Wesson, *The Cosmological Constant Problem and Kaluza-Klein Theory*, Int.J. Mod. Phys. D **10**, 905-912, (2001), gr-qc/0104045; *Is Mass Quantized?*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19**, 19952000, (2004), gr-qc/0309100; *The Equivalence Principle as a Probe for Higher Dimensions*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **14**, 2315-2318, (2005), gr-qc/0601065; *Wave Mechanics and General Relativity: A Rapprochement*, Gen.Rel.Grav. **38**, 937-944, (2006), gr-qc/0601059.
J.M. Overduin, *Solar System Tests of the Equivalence Principle and Constraints on Higher-Dimensional Gravity*, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 102001, (2000), gr-qc/0007047.
47. M. Biesiada, B. Malec, *White dwarf constraints on exotic physics*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 043008, (2002), astro-ph/0109545; *Astrophysics and Space Science* **283**, No.4, (2003).
48. M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 502, (1981); Nucl.Phys.B **198**, 441, (1982).
M. Kaku, *Introduction to Superstrings*, (Springer, New York), (1988).
49. M. Besançon, *Looking for extra-dimensions at the weak scale: experimental search for Kaluza-Klein states signatures at the e+e- linear collider*, hep-ph/9909364; *Experimental signatures of extra-dimensions at colliders*, in XXIX International Conference of Theoretical Physics *Matter to the Deepest*, Acta Phys. Pol. B **36**, No.11, 3487, (2005) (with numerous references). B. Grzadkowski, J. Wudka, *Light excitations in 5-dimensional gauge theories*, in XXIX International Conference of Theoretical Physics *Matter to the Deepest*, Acta Phys. Pol. B **36**, No.11, 3523, (2005). J. Wudka, *A short course in effective Lagrangians*, Lectures delivered at the VII Mexican Workshop on Particles and Fields, Merida, Yucatan, Mexico, 10-17 November, (1999), AIP Conf.Proc. **531**, 81-101, (2000), hep-ph/0002180.
50. A. Ashtekar, (with R.S. Tate), *Lectures on Non-Perturbative Canonical Gravity*, (World Scientific, Singapore), (1991).
51. J. Syska, *Geometric model of the structure of the neutron*, on the 03rd of March 2009 sent for the review to General Relativity and Gravitation, (March 2009).